

## **REMARKS**

**[0010]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 7-12 and 14-52 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 2, 17, 30, 31, 34, 35, 43, and 52 are amended herein
- No new claims are added herein

**[0011]** Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification as originally filed; thus no new matter is introduced via amendment.

### **Specification Objections**

**[0012]** The Specification stands objected to as allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection, but nevertheless amends the specification herein, as shown above, to address the Office Action.

### **Claim Objections**

**[0013]** Claims 1 and 52 stand objected to. Applicant respectfully traverses the objections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's position, Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 52. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment renders the objections moot.

## **Claim 52 Complies With § 112 2nd Paragraph**

**[0014]** Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**[0015]** Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 52. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment renders the § 112, ¶ 2 rejections moot.

## **Eyal Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14, 17-23, 26-28, 30-39 and 41-52**

**[0016]** Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14, 17-23, 26-28, 30-39 and 41-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Eyal, U.S. Patent No. 6,389,467 (“Eyal”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); also see MPEP §2131.

<sup>2</sup> See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Independent Claim 1

**[0017]** Applicant asserts that Eyal fails to anticipate this claim. Eyal does not disclose each feature of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

A method implemented in a component object-based multimedia framework of an operating system executing on a computing device, the method comprising:

receiving a uniform resource locator (URL) as associated with one of a plurality of applications requesting media content;

identifying a scheme associated with the URL;

selecting a first object operated to handle the identified scheme associated with the URL to access parameter data from a location specified by the URL;

invoking the first object and determining whether the first object produces a second object according to a requested media content type;

in an event the second object is produced according to the requested media content type, then returning the second object to the one of the plurality of applications;

in an event the second object comprises a media source object, then returning the media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via a component object-based pipeline, the pipeline comprising:

the media source object performing format-specific parsing to produce one or more streams of data that are sent through the pipeline, and

one or more media sinks rendering or archiving the media content; and

in an event the second object comprises a byte stream object and the requested media content type is a media source object or a timeline object, then invoking one or more selected byte stream handlers to generate the requested media source object, wherein the byte stream handler is selected based in part on the byte stream object, and returning the requested media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via the component object-based pipeline.

**[0018]** Claim 1, as amended recites in part, “invoking the first object and determining whether the first object produces a second object according to a requested media content type; in an event the second object is produced according to the requested media content type, then returning the second object to the one of the plurality of applications; in an event the second object comprises a

media source object, then returning the media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via a component object-based pipeline, the pipeline comprising: the media source object performing format-specific parsing to produce one or more streams of data that are sent through the pipeline, and one or more media sinks rendering or archiving the media content; and in an event the second object comprises a byte stream object and the requested media content type is a media source object or a timeline object, then invoking one or more selected byte stream handlers to generate the requested media source object, wherein the byte stream handler is selected based in part on the byte stream object, and returning the requested media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via the component object-based pipeline.”

**[0019]** The Office has relied on Eyal in rejection. Eyal discloses that a network enabled device receives search criteria and accesses a memory that includes a plurality of network addresses, and the memory of Eyal associates each address with one or more classes of information. Each address in the memory locates a media network resource. A plurality of the addresses are selected using the search criteria, and the selected addresses are signaled to the network enabled device. A media playback component on the network enabled device sequentially plays back the media resources provided by at least some of the selected addresses automatically.

**[0020]** As highlighted by the amendment, the claim recites “invoking the first object and determining whether the first object produces a second object according to a requested media content type; in an event the second object is produced according to the requested media content type, then returning the second object to the one of the plurality of applications; in an event the second object comprises a

media source object, then returning the media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via a component object-based pipeline, the pipeline comprising: the media source object performing format-specific parsing to produce one or more streams of data that are sent through the pipeline, and one or more media sinks rendering or archiving the media content; and in an event the second object comprises a byte stream object and the requested media content type is a media source object or a timeline object, then invoking one or more selected byte stream handlers to generate the requested media source object, wherein the byte stream handler is selected based in part on the byte stream object, and returning the requested media source object to the one of the plurality of applications via the component object-based pipeline.” Eyal clearly does not disclose each and every element and feature recited in the claim as amended.

**[0021]** Consequently, Eyal does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

*Independent Claims 17, 35, 43, and 52*

**[0022]** Independent claims 17, 35, 43, and 52 each recite at least one element and/or feature similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1. Thus, claims 17, 35, 43, and 52 are asserted patentable over Eyal for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Eyal does not anticipate these claims, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 18-34, 36-42, and 44-51

**[0023]** Claims 2, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 18-34, 36-42, and 44-51 each ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 17, 35, and 43. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, 35, and 43 are not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 18-34, 36-42, and 44-51 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 15, 16, 24, 25, 29 and 40 Are Non-Obvious Over Eyal in view of Klemets

**[0024]** Claims 15, 16, 24, 25, 29 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Eyal in view of Klemets, et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236906 (“Klemets”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting issuance, and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s position, Applicant has amended the independent claims from which these claims depend. As discussed above, the independent claims are asserted patentable over Eyal; the independent claims are also asserted patentable over Eyal in view of Klemets because Klemets does not cure the deficiencies in Eyal noted above. Therefore, these claims are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

## **Conclusion**

**[0025]** Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

By: /Bea Koempel-Thomas 58213/  
Bea Koempel-Thomas  
(bea@leehayes.com; 509-944-4759)  
Registration No. 58213

Dated: 07/10/2009